



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/714,449      | 11/16/2000  | Gabriel Vogeli       | 00237.US1           | 5102             |

26657 7590 12/02/2002

WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ MACKIEWICZ & NORRIS LLP

EXAMINER

ATTENTION: SUZANNE E. MILLER ESQ.  
ONE LIBERTY PLACE, 46TH FLOOR  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

MURPHY, JOSEPH F

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1646

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2002

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                             |                  |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | Application No.             | Applicant(s)     |
|                              | 09/714,449                  | VOGELI ET AL.    |
|                              | Examiner<br>Joseph F Murphy | Art Unit<br>1646 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-97 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 36-76, 78-79, 86-97 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-35, 77 and 80-85 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5-6, 14-

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election with traverse of the Group comprising SEQ ID NO: 85, claims 1-35, 77, 80-85 in Paper No. 16 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is no burden to search all the claims. Applicant's attention is directed to MPEP 808.02 which states that "Where the related inventions as claimed are shown to be distinct under the criteria of MPEP 806.05 (c-i), the examiner, in order to establish reasons for insisting upon restriction, must show by appropriate explanation one of the following: (A) Separate classification thereof; (B) A separate status in the art when they are classifiable together; (C) A different field of search." The separate classification established for each Group demonstrates that each distinct Group has attained recognition in the art as a separate subject for inventive effort, and also a separate field of search. Thus, the Restriction requirement is proper.

As discussed in (b), the separate classification established for each Group demonstrates that each distinct Group requires a separate field of search, and a search of one Group would not reveal art on the other Groups, thus imposing a burden on the examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1-97 are pending. Claims 1-35, 77, 80-85 are elected. Claims 36-76, 78-79, 86-97 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b).

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed 7/10/2001 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to

be listed. References BV-CH, DI, DX, EN, IK have not been considered. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of an item of information contained in an information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) is the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements. See MPEP § 609 C(1-2).

***Claim Objections***

Claims 1-35, 77, 80-85 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims contain limitations directed to non-elected inventions. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC §§ 101, 112, first paragraph***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-35, 77, 80-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because they are drawn to an invention with no apparent or disclosed patentable utility. The instant application has provided a description of an isolated DNA encoding a protein and the protein encoded thereby. The instant application does not disclose the biological role of this protein or its significance. The claimed invention is not supported by either a credible, specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility. Novel biological molecules lack well-established utility and must undergo

extensive experimentation. Applicant is directed to the Utility Examination Guidelines, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1092-1099, Friday January 5, 2001.

It is clear from the instant specification that the nucleic acid encoding the NGPCR-54 polypeptide has been assigned a function because of its similarity to known proteins (Specification at 18, line 11). However, it is commonly known in the art that sequence-to-function methods of assigning protein function are prone to errors (Doerks et al. 1998). These errors can be due to sequence similarity of the query region to a region of the alleged similar protein that is not the active site, as well as homologs that did not have the same catalytic activity because active site residues of the characterized family were not conserved (Doerks et al. page 248, column 3, fourth and fifth paragraphs). Inaccurate use of sequence-to-function methods have led to significant function-annotation errors in the sequence databases (Doerks et al. page 250, column 1, third paragraph). Furthermore, Brenner (1999, Trends in Genetics 15:132-133) argues that accurate inference of function from homology must be a difficult problem since, assuming there are only about 1000 major gene superfamilies in nature, then most homologs must have different molecular and cellular functions. Finally, Bork et al. (1996, Trends in Genetics 12:425-427) add that the software robots that assign functions to new proteins often assign a function to a whole new protein based on structural similarity of a small domain of the new protein to a small domain of a known protein. Such questionable interpretations are written into the sequence database and are then considered facts.

Additionally, even if, *arguendo*, the nucleic acid encoding the NGPCR-54 protein is found to be a G-protein coupled receptor, it is an orphan receptor. Since the ligand to this receptor is unknown, the function of the protein is also unknown. Neither the specification nor

the art of record disclose any diseases or conditions associated with the function or expression of the NGPCR-54 protein, therefore, there is no "real world" context of use. Further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use is required. In the instant case, the fact that the claimed invention encodes a GPCR is not sufficient to establish a specific and substantial utility. Although GPCRs have been found to be involved in many different processes and have been the target of much research and drug discovery, unless the specific ligand for each receptor is known, unless the biological activity of the receptor is disclosed and unless the processes that each receptor is involved in are identified, the receptor has no "real world" use, and therefore, lacks specific and substantial utility.

After complete characterization, this protein may be found to have a patentable utility. This further characterization, however, is part of the act of invention and until it has been undertaken Applicant's claimed invention is incomplete. The instant situation is directly analogous to that which was addressed in *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 USPQ 689 (Sup. Ct., 1966), in which a novel compound which was structurally analogous to other compounds which were known to possess anticancer activity was alleged to be potentially useful as an antitumor agent in the absence of evidence supporting this utility. The court expressed the opinion that all chemical compounds are "useful" to the chemical arts when this term is given its broadest interpretation. However, the court held that this broad interpretation was not the intended definition of "useful" as it appears in 35 USC § 101, which requires that an invention must have either an immediately obvious or fully disclosed "real world" utility. The court held that:

"The basic quid pro quo contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial

utility", "[u]nless and until a process is refined and developed to this point-where specific benefit exists in currently available form-there is insufficient justification for permitting an applicant to engross what may prove to be a broad field", and "a patent is not a hunting license", "[i]t is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion."

The instant claims are drawn to a nucleic acid encoding a polypeptide which has an as yet undetermined function or biological significance. Until some actual and specific significance can be attributed to the protein identified in the specification as NGPCR-54, the instant invention is incomplete. The polypeptide encoded by the nucleic acids of the instant invention is known to be structurally analogous to proteins that are known in the art as G protein coupled receptors. In the absence of knowledge of the natural substrate or biological significance of this protein, there is no immediately obvious patentable use for it. To employ a protein of the instant invention in the identification of substances which inhibit its activity is clearly to use it as the object of further research which has been determined by the courts to be a non-patentable utility. Since the instant specification does not disclose a "real world" use for NGPCR-54 then the claimed invention is incomplete and, therefore, does not meet the requirements of 35 USC § 101 as being useful.

Claims 1-35, 77, 80-85 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

If, *arguendo*, the claims are found to have a patentable utility, claims 1-35, 77, 80-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a nucleic acid encoding an amino acid of SEQ ID NO: 85, or a nucleic acid with the sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO: 86, does not reasonably provide enablement for a nucleic acid encoding an amino acid which is a fragment of SEQ ID NO: 85, or a nucleic acid encoding an amino acid which is homologous to SEQ ID NO: 85. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claims 1-35, 77, 80-85 are overly broad since insufficient guidance is provided as to which of the myriad of variant nucleic acids encode polypeptides which will retain the characteristics of NGPCR-54. Applicants do not disclose any actual or prophetic examples on expected performance parameters of any of the possible muteins of NGPCR-54. It is known in the art that even single amino acid changes or differences in the amino acid sequence of a protein can have dramatic effects on the protein's function. It is also known in the art that a single amino acid change in a protein's sequence can drastically affect the structure of the protein and the architecture of an entire cell. For example, Voet et al. (1990) teaches that a single Glu to Val substitution in the beta subunit of hemoglobin causes the hemoglobin molecules to associate with one another in such a manner that, in homozygous individuals, erythrocytes are altered from their normal discoid shape and assume the sickle shape characteristic of sickle-cell anemia, causing hemolytic anemia and blood flow blockages (pages 126-128, section 6-3A and page 230, column 2, first paragraph).

Since the claims encompass variant nucleic acids and given the art recognized unpredictability of the effect of mutations on protein function, it would require undue experimentation to make and use the claimed invention. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. The test of enablement is not whether any experimentation is necessary, but whether, if experimentation is necessary, it is undue. The factors considered to be relevant in the instant case are set forth below:

- (1) the breadth of the claims - The claims are drawn to a nucleic acid encoding an amino acid which is a fragment of SEQ ID NO: 85, or a nucleic acid encoding an amino acid which is homologous to SEQ ID NO: 86.
- (2) the nature of the invention - The instant invention is a nucleic acid encoding an amino acid which is a fragment of SEQ ID NO: 85, or a nucleic acid encoding an amino acid which is homologous to SEQ ID NO: 86.
- (3) the state of the prior art - The Voet reference demonstrates that even single amino acid changes or differences in the amino acid sequence of a protein can have dramatic effects on the protein's function.
- (5) the level of predictability in the art - The Voet reference demonstrates the unpredictability of the protein art.
- (6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor - Applicant has only taught a nucleic acid with a sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO: 86, and the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 85.
- (7) the existence of working examples - Working examples are not provided for NGPCR-54.

(8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. Given the breadth of claims 1-35, 77, 80-85 in light of the predictability of the art as determined by the number of working examples, the level of skill of the artisan, and the guidance provided in the instant specification and the prior art of record, it would require undue experimentation for one of ordinary skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

Claims 1-35, 77, 80-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

These are genus claims. The claims are drawn to a nucleic acid encoding an amino acid which is a fragment of SEQ ID NO: 85, or a nucleic acid encoding an amino acid which is homologous to SEQ ID NO: 85. The specification and claim do not indicate what distinguishing attributes shared by the members of the genus. The specification and claim do not place any limit on the number of amino acid substitutions, deletions, insertions and/or additions that may be made to the encoded SEQ ID NO: 85. Thus, the scope of the claim includes numerous structural variants, and the genus is highly variant because a significant number of structural differences between genus members is permitted. The specification and claim do not provide any guidance

as to what changes should be made. Structural features that could distinguish compounds in the genus from others in the protein class are missing from the disclosure. No common structural attributes identify the members of the genus. The general knowledge and level of skill in the art do not supplement the omitted description because specific, not general, guidance is what is needed. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, a nucleic acid with a sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO: 86, and the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 85 is insufficient to describe the genus. One of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe the genus. Thus, applicant was not in possession of the claimed genus.

Claim 80 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Due to the limitation of "allelic variant" recited in the claim, a determination of what the claim as a whole covers indicates that elements which are not particularly described, e.g. the sequence of the claimed allelic variants, are encompassed by this claim. There is no actual reduction to practice of the claimed invention, or complete detailed description of the structure. A biomolecular sequence described only by a functional characteristic, in this case an allelic variant of a nucleic acid encoding a protein whose sequence is set forth in SEQ ID NO: 85, without any known or disclosed correlation between the function and the structure of the

sequence is not a sufficient identifying characteristic. See University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co. 43 USPQ2d at 1406. There is no known or disclosed correlation between this function and the structure of the non-described allelic variants and the disclosed polypeptide with an amino acid sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO: 85. Weighing all factors in view of the level of knowledge and skill in the art, one skilled in the art would not recognize from the disclosure that the Applicant was in possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 77 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

Claim 77 defines a nucleic acid ligand by a function alone, i.e. it is useful as a probe for identifying polymorphisms in a human nGPCR-54 gene, wherein the polymorphism is disclosed. However, in University of California v. Eli Lilly, 119 F.3 at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406. the Court decided that a definition by function alone "does not suffice" to sufficiently describe a nucleic acid sequence "because it is only an indication of what the gene does, rather than what it is." Further, "it is only a definition of a useful result rather than a definition of what achieves that result...The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-9, 27-32, 77, 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stratagene (1991).

The Stratagene catalogue teaches the use of random 9-mers capable of hybridizing to all gene sequences. The random primers meet the limitations of claims 1-9 in that they comprise nucleic acids that are fragments of SEQ ID NO: 86, they comprise nucleic acids complementary to at least a portion of SEQ ID NO: 86. The random primers are in a kit, and meet the structural limitations set forth in claim 77. The random primers would hybridize to a complement of SEQ ID NO: 85.

Claims 1-32, 80-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Janssens et al. (1996).

Janssens et al. teaches the cloning and expression of the human P2Y1 receptor (page 590, Figure 1). The nucleic acid cloned by Janssens et al. encodes a fragment of a polypeptide as set forth in SEQ ID NO: 85 (see Sequence Comparison A, attached), thus claims 1-9, 80, 82 are anticipated. The nucleic acid of Janssens et al. was cloned into an expression vector, and transfected into host cells (page 589, paragraphs 1 and 2), thus claims 10-26, 81, 83-85 are anticipated. The nucleic acid of Janssens et al. is complementary to a portion of a nucleic acid

encoding SEQ ID NO: 85(page 589, paragraphs 1 and 2), thus claims 27-30 are anticipated. The nucleic acid of Janssens et al. was in an acceptable carrier, thus claims 31-32 are anticipated.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-35, 80-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janssens et al. (1996) in view of WO/9401548 (Sibson et al.).

The teaching of Janssens et al. has been set forth *supra*. in view of Sibson et al. (WO/9401548). The claims recite vectors and cells comprising the nucleic acids of the invention, as well as methods of producing proteins. As taught in the above rejections under 35 USC 102, the primary reference teaches the claimed nucleic acid. Janssens et al. do not teach methods of producing proteins. However, Sibson et al. do teach the use of vectors and cells to express DNA, as well as methods of producing proteins.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the invention of Sibson et al. by substituting a cDNA in the polycloning region of the vector with the polynucleotide (cDNA) of Janssens et al. for the purpose of transfecting a host cell as taught by Sibson et al. in view of Sibson et al.'s suggestion that it would be desirable to do so (pages 8-13). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this substitution in order to express the protein encoded by the introduced DNA in a host cell to perform ligand binding and functional assays. There would have been a reasonable expectation of success for a person of ordinary skill in the art to make this invention since these techniques are widely used in the art and are highly successful (Sibson et al., page 10, line 38 - page 12, line 42). The present invention, therefore, is *prima facia* obvious over the above references in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Claim 77 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janssens et al. (1996) as applied to claims 1-32, 80-85 *supra*, and further in view of the Stratagene catalog (1988, page 39).

The rejection of claims 1-32, 80-85 have been set forth in the above prior art rejection. However, the reference does not teach the use of a kit. The Stratagene catalog does teach a motivation to combine reagents of use into a kit (page 39, column 1). It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the nucleic acid molecule as taught by Janssens et al. into a kit as taught by Stratagene since the Stratagene catalog teaches a motivation for combining reagents of use in any assay into a kit. It states that "Each kit provides two services: 1) a variety of different regents have been

assembled and premixed specifically for a defined set of experiments. Thus one need not purchase gram quantities of 1 different reagents, each of which is needed in only microgram amounts, when beginning a series of experiments. When one considers all of the unused chemicals that typically accumulate in weighing rooms, desiccators, and freezers, one quickly realizes that it is actually far more expensive for a small number of users to prepare most buffer solutions from the basic reagents. Stratagene provides only the quantities you will actually need, premixed and tested. In actuality, the kit format saves money and resources for everyone by dramatically reducing waste. 2) The other service provided in a kit is quality control" (page 39, column 1).

### *Conclusion*

No claim is allowed.

***Advisory Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph F. Murphy whose telephone number is 703-305-7245. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on 703-308-6564. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3014 for regular communications and 703-308-0294 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.



Joseph F. Murphy, Ph. D.  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1646  
November 27, 2002